

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 050 895

RE 003 499

AUTHOR Olson, Arthur V.; Rosen, Carl L.  
TITLE Exploration of the Structure of Selected Reading Readiness Tests.  
PUB DATE Feb 71  
NOTE 9p.; Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, N.Y., Feb. 5-7, 1971  
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29  
DESCRIPTORS \*Achievement Tests, Associative Learning, Auditory Perception, Concept Formation, \*Factor Analysis, \*Grade 1, Intelligence Tests, Perceptual Development, \*Predictive Validity, Reading Readiness, \*Reading Readiness Tests, Standardized Tests, Visual Perception

ABSTRACT

The technique of factor analysis was used to explore the structure of five batteries of readiness tests (Gates Reading Readiness Test, Developmental Tests of Visual Perception, Metropolitan Readiness Tests, Specially Constructed Readiness Test by Olson, and Wechsler Intelligence for Children) as predictor variables for the Stanford Achievement Test, Primary I Battery. These tests were administered to 218 first-grade children. Four factors (Verbal-Conceptual Ability, Auditory-Visual Association, Specific Readiness, and Specific Perceptual Organization) were retained for rotation, employing the maxplane method. Intercorrelations among the oblique factors indicated a degree of interdependence between factors 1, 2, and 3. Among the findings were (1) that specific subtests from the Developmental Tests of Visual Perception and the Metropolitan Tests were found to make limited contributions to the prediction of reading achievement and (2) that the specific readiness factor and the specific perceptual organization factor were both independent of reading achievement. The need for further exploration similar to this study was suggested. Tables and references are included. (AW)

Exploration of The Structure of Selected  
Reading Readiness Tests

Arthur V. Olson

Carl L. Rosen

Georgia State University

Studies concerned with the usefulness of various reading readiness instruments have utilized both crude correlational techniques predicting single reading criterion variables from one predictor variable, or as is more frequently the case today, studies in this area are applying techniques of multiple correlation and multiple regression. Silberberg, Iverson and Silberberg (1) for example, using stepwise linear regression techniques computed prediction equations for assessing the predictive utility of the Gates Reading Readiness tests, Chronological Age, and Stanford-Binet IQ in predicting first-grade reading achievement as measured by the Developmental Reading Tests. Several other studies in this area utilizing such techniques can be found in the literature.

One area that seems as relevant as these problems, is the need for a more satisfactory understanding of the structure of the readiness instruments in such studies. The techniques of Factor Analysis can be used for the purposes of such explorations, which involve the identification of abilities that might underlie various readiness batteries. The isolation of such influences on various combinations of criterion variables could contribute to a more sophisticated understanding of the characteristics being measured by these instruments, as well as their relative contribution to the prediction of reading behavior. The present study explored the structure of five batteries of readiness measures as predictor variables for one commonly used achievement test in reading at the first-grade level.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

### Procedure

A battery of five readiness tests and a reading achievement test was administered to 218 first-grade children representing a stratified sample of the socio-economic breakdown in three elementary schools in a city of approximately 45,000 people in the southeast. The battery consisted of (1) Gates Reading Readiness Test (1939), (2) Developmental Tests of Visual Perception (1963), (3) Metropolitan Readiness Tests (1950), (4) Specially Constructed Readiness Test by Olson\* (1966), (5) Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children (1949), and (6) Stanford Achievement Test - Primary I Battery (1964).

The six instruments consisted of 35 sub-test variables which were correlated and the resulting matrices subjected to a principal components analysis employing unities in the main diagonal. The matrix was factor analyzed by the principal axis method to obtain the initial solution. Components whose latent roots were 1.00 or larger were retained and rotated to the varimax criterion following the suggestion of Kaiser (2). A second criteria applied to determine the number of factors to be retained for rotation was based on Cattell's Scree Test (3) involving the examination of eigenvalues. Finally, the psychological meaningfulness of the obtained factor structure following rotations was considered.

### Results

For this problem, six factors were extracted with eigenvalues greater than one, accounting for 63.2 percent of the total variance. The Scree Tests suggested a four factor solution, the first four factors accounted for 56.7 percent of the variance. Thus, for interpretive purposes both the six factor and the four

\* The Olson Reading Readiness Tests consists of the following sub-tests (1) Auditory Synthesis split-half reliability ( $r=.80$ ), (2) Identifying Capital Letters Named ( $r=.94$ ), (3) Identifying Lower Case Letters Named ( $r=.91$ ), (4) Writing Letters ( $r=.94$ ), (5) Learning Rate ( $r=.62$ ), (6) Auditory Discrimination ( $r=.74$ ).

factor solutions were rotated by the normal varimax procedure in an effort to achieve simple structure.

The rotated factor structure for the six factors revealed four large common factors and two small factors, loading only two variables each. These two factors appeared unimportant and the results supported the indication that a four factor solution was more appropriate. From examination of the rotated factor structure for the four factor solution, it was obvious that the orthogonal varimax rotations did not produce an adequate simple structure. To obtain simple structure it was necessary to rotate by the oblique procedure. The four factors were thus rotated by the maxplane method. Table I shows the hyperplane counts\* obtained by the varimax and maxplane methods and the correlations among oblique factors. A study of the intercorrelations among the oblique factors indicated a degree of interdependence between factors I, II and III.

---

Insert Table I here

---

Table II presents the rotated factor loadings for the four factors along with their respective reference structure loadings or correlations with the simple axis.

---

Insert Table II here

---

\* The number of obtained loadings within a specified range is called the hyperplane width. In this case 0.10 was specified as the hyperplane width.

Factor I: This is clearly a Verbal-Conceptual Factor with three of the WISC subtests saturating the factor; Similarities, Vocabulary and Information. The Stanford Achievement Vocabulary subtest also has a substantial loading on this factor indicating the strong influence of verbal ability on this particular reading achievement subtest. Five additional WISC subtests have substantial to moderate loading on this factor; Picture Arrangement, Block Design, Digit Span, Comprehension and Arithmetic. The Olson subtest Auditory Synthesis has a small loading on this factor as well as WISC Object Assemble, and Paragraph Meaning and Word Reading from the Stanford Achievement tests. It is of interest to note the slight tendency for the reading subtests to load on this factor although the loadings are small.

Factor II: Inspection of the loading pattern suggests that this factor might be called an Auditory-Visual Association Factor. Four of the six subtests of the Olson Readiness Test have major loadings on this factor as well as the subtest Word-Card Matching from the Gates Reading Readiness Test. Of interest is the slight tendency for two Stanford Achievement reading subtests to load in this factor; Paragraph Meaning (.38) and Word Reading (.31).

Factor III: This appears to be a Specific Readiness Factor defined by the WISC Coding, and Information, and Matching and Sentences subtests from the Metropolitan Readiness Test. WISC Picture Completion and Metropolitan Word Meaning subtests have small loadings on this factor which appears to have an audio-visual discrimination influence. This factor seems to be relatively specific to portions of the Metropolitan Readiness Test and WISC and is essentially independent of reading achievement as measured by the Stanford Achievement Test and those aspects of verbal ability measured by the WISC. The slight loading of Frostig subtest Spatial Relations is also of interest.

Factor IV: Inspection of the loading pattern suggests that this clearly is a Specific Perceptual Organization Factor. Visual motor and figure ground subtests have major loadings for this factor. Rhyming, Object Assembly and Position in Space have quite small (.358, .305, .216) loadings. This factor is clearly distinguishable from other perceptual or readiness measures as well as reading achievement as is measured in this study.

#### Summary and Discussion

Matrices of correlations among 35 subtests from a battery of five readiness tests and a reading achievement test were factored and rotated first to the varimax criterion and then by means of an oblique procedure, rotated by the maxplane method. Four factors were retained for rotation, employing the maxplane method. The four factors are Verbal-Conceptual Ability, Auditory-Visual Association, Specific Readiness, and Specific Perceptual Organization.

The loading pattern in this study indicated a relative degree of interdependence between factors I, II and III. Specific subtests from the Metropolitan Readiness Tests and the Developmental tests of Visual Perception appear to make limited contributions to the prediction of reading achievement as was measured in this study. There was a strong loading of the Vocabulary subtest from the Stanford Achievement test on factor I and very slight loadings of two other reading subtests on this factor. This first factor called Verbal Conceptual ability was saturated with three specific WISC subtests. A second factor, Auditory-Visual Association, which was saturated with four subtests from the Olson Readiness Tests also was noted to have moderate loadings from the Paragraph Reading and Word Reading subtests of the Stanford Achievement tests. A Specific Readiness Factor was identified which was independent of reading achievement as was a fourth factor called Specific Perceptual Organization.

Rosen and Ohnmacht (4) have reported a factor analytic study of first-grade readiness that confirms the limited contribution to predicting reading achievement made by specific subtests of the Developmental Test of Visual Perception and the Metropolitan Readiness Test. This study also replicates the findings of the Rosen, Ohnmacht regarding the suggested lack of construct validity in the Frostig instrument for the construct of Flexibility of Closure. These findings do not support those of Goins (5) and Barrett (6) in which the closure factor as measured by a different perceptual instrument contributed to the prediction of reading.

There seems to be a need for further exploration of the Auditory-Visual-Association Factor identified in this study, which was saturated with four subtests from Olson's Readiness Tests with moderate loading on Paragraph Reading and smaller loading on Word Reading subtests from the Stanford Achievement Test. Performance in such readiness abilities could be related as Barrett (6) has indicated to a whole constellation of environmental experiences or they might also imply intrinsic psycholinguistic facilities of some cruciality to the reading tasks tapped in the above two reading subtests.

There continues to be a need therefore, for investigations designed to explore various reading readiness constructs with the goal of further isolating those factors which seem most critical to specific reading behaviors at particular points in time in the developmental sequence. Postulating some theoretical hierarchy and sequence of such abilities as they differentially contribute at various stages of learning to various finite reading behaviors could eventually have profound implications for some of the practical problems in readiness appraisal and training so common today.

## References

- 1 Silberberg, N., Iverson, I., and Silberberg, H., "The Predictive Efficiency of the Gates Reading Readiness Tests", Elementary School Journal, Vol. 68, 1968, pp. 213-218.
- 2 Kaiser, H., "The Application of Electronic Computers to Factor Analysis", Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. 20, No. 1, Spring, 1960, pp. 141-151.
- 3 Cattell, R., "The Scree Test for the Number of Factors", Multivariate Behavioral Research, Vol. 1, April, 1966, pp. 245-276.
- 4 Rosen, C., and Ohnmacht, F., "Perception, Readiness and Reading Achievement in the First Grade", Perception and Reading, (Helen K. Smith, Editor), Vol. 12, Part 4, Proceedings of 12th Annual Convention, Inter Reading Association, Newark, Delaware, 1967, pp. 33-39.
- 5 Barrett, Thomas C., "Visual Discrimination Tasks as Predictors of First Grade Reading Achievement", Reading Teacher, Vol. 18, No. 4, January, 1965, pp. 276-282.
- 6 Goins, Jean T., "Visual Perceptual Abilities and Early Reading Progress", Supplementary Educational Monographs, No. 87, February, 1958, University of Chicago Press, p. 98.



Table I Factor Intercorrelations and Hyperplane  
Count Comparisons for The 35 Sub-Tests

	<u>Factors</u>			
	I	II	III	IV
I	1.000			
II	.716	1.000		
III	.662	.540	1.000	
IV	.395	.375	.485	1.000
Varimax %	17.1	14.3	8.6	11.4
Maxplane%	48.6	51.4	40.0	57.1

Table II Oblique Factor Structure

Factor I - Verbal-Conceptual Ability				Factor III - Specific Readiness			
<u>Loading</u>	<u>Variable</u>			<u>Loading</u>	<u>Variable</u>		
.713	Similarities (W)			.535	Coding (W)		
.634	Vocabulary (W)			.478	Information (M)		
.626	Information (W)			.420	Matching (M)		
.560	Vocabulary (ST)			.397	Sentences (M)		
.479	Picture Arrangement (W)			.350	Picture Completion (W)		
.471	Block Design (W)			.310	Word Meaning (M)		
.417	Digit Span (W)			.285	Picture Directions (G)		
.414	Comprehension (W)			.266	Spatial Relations (F)		
.384	Arithmetic (W)						
.360	Auditory Syntheses (O)						
.341	Object Assembly (W)						
.327	Paragraph Meaning (ST)						
.313	Word Reading (ST)						
Factor II - Auditory-Visual Association				Factor IV - Specific Perceptual Organization			
<u>Loading</u>	<u>Variable</u>			<u>Loading</u>	<u>Variable</u>		
.632	Lower Case Letters (O)			.581	Visual - Motor (F)		
.604	Writing Letters (O)			.579	Figure Ground (F)		
.537	Capital Letters (O)			.358	Rhyming (G)		
.426	Learning Rate for Words (O)			.305	Object Assembly (W)		
.425	Word-Card Matching (G)			.216	Position in Space (F)		
.380	Paragraph Meaning (ST)						
.362	Vocabulary (W)						
.359	Word Matching (G)						
.337	Numbers (M)						
.320	Copying (M)						
.317	Word Reading (ST)						
.287	Auditory Discrimination (O)						

Code

G= Gates Reading Readiness Test

F= Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception

ST = Stanford Achievement Test

M= Metropolitan Readiness Test

O= Olson Reading Readiness Tests

W= WISC